

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remain of the opinion that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the substitute abstract, amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Claims Status and Claim Amendments

Claims 1-10 are pending in this Application.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to rephrase to more particularly recite the feature of the invention. Support for the amendments can be seen from the figures 1-4 and the original wordings of the Claim 1.

All claims have been amended to confirm to the US practice.

No new matter was added.

II. The Office Action

A. The Specification

The Examiner objected the abstract.

Applicants have provided a Substitute Abstract to replace to Abstract originally filed.

It is respectfully submitted that the abstract are now proper.

B. Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Examiner had rejected claims 1-10 under 35 USC § 112 for indefinite issues.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more particularly point out the “drawer guide” and changed the transitional phrase “consist of” into “comprising”.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now definite.

C. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 as being anticipated by Mitchell.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the claimed invention, particularly, claim 1 recite: blocking system for a file cabinet comprising:

- a) a pull shaft provided on a drawer guide;
- b) a support platen fastened to the file cabinet, having a groove-rail with at least a first section and a second section forming an angle with each other;
- c) a mobile blocking element engaged with the groove-rail, provided with two emerging bolts that can move linearly on the said groove-rail, wherein the two emerging bolts are arranged with a distance in between accommodating the pull shaft;
- d) two mobile arms aligned vertically with each other with two meeting ends having a slanting edge, said mobile arms are movably installed on a vertical rail on the support platen, which can move linearly on the vertical rail with a maximum amplitude; wherein the mobile blocking element is pulled by the pull shaft under the slanting edge and placed between the meeting ends of the two mobile arms to lock other drawers, such that opening one drawer prevents all others from being opened.

These features are totally different from that of Mitchell. Mitchell teaches a drawer interlock structure having a channel-like plural station frame supporting at each station a cam on one side of the frame and an operably connected slider movable by the cam on the other side of the frame. A trip pin is attached to each drawer and is located in the opening and closing of each drawer to operably engage the cam. As the cam moves and the slider is displaced a taut strap of flexible material is displaced against a spring force at opening of any one drawer and the spring is limited in its extension by a blocker whereby no other drawers can be opened until closure of the one opened drawer and whereby simultaneous movement of plural drawers are blocked by the limitedly blocked spring loaded strap. The withdrawal of the slider from a positive block against the cam is prevented until the single opened drawer is closed. Simple locking of the structure is by means of a lock device disabling any movement of the strap.

Shown clearly by the figures that, Mitchell uses a cam to displace a taut strap of flexible material to trigger the lock system, while the present invention uses a mobile blocking element to push open the aligned two mobile arms to lock other drawers.

Applicants understood that the previous claim wording in the European format may cause some difficulties for a full appreciation of the invention. Applicants wish to point out that Mitchell does not teach at least the key part, a mobile blocking element with two emerging bolts moving linearly on the groove rail. The moving of this mobile blocking element by pulling the full shaft places one of the emerging bolts between the two ends of the aligned mobile arms, so that the displaced arm shaft stops the opening of the other drawers.

It is respectfully submitted that Mitchell does not teach each and every of the limitations in the claims 1-10. Therefore, claims 1-10 are patentable over the cited reference.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,
LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP

By:



Yaodong Chen 0267
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, New York
Tel. # 212-661-8000